

Narrative data and analysis in Second Language teaching and learning

Nugrahenny T. Zacharias

English Department, Miami University, Ohio, USA

Abstract

The present paper offers a modest contribution to the existing and ongoing attempt to find a place for narrative research in language education. The purpose is mainly to explore and highlight insights gleaned from narrative research with regard to narrative data and analysis. Due to the diverse and unique nature of second language learning and teaching, I would argue that gathering narrative data from second language learners are paramount and in line with the existing attempt to view second language teaching and learning in its own right and not as imitation of first language learning. To develop my argument, I will first discuss the position of narrative research in second language education highlighting the contribution and insights that narrative research brings to second language teaching and learning. I will proceed to define narrative research and explains the various tools to elicit narrative data as well as issues that narrative researcher needs to consider when collecting narrative data. The paper ends by looking at issues and strategies in analyzing narrative data. In all of the discussion, relevant research is cited to illustrate the point being discussed. The paper will end by highlighting that the discussion about narrative data and analysis are not aimed to replace other tools of data elicitation and analysis. Rather, it aims to invite teachers and researchers to see narratives as a viable option in research as the methodology continues to move forward.

Keywords: narrative research, Second Language Education, research methodology

Introduction

Narrative research has informed almost every discipline and profession and is no longer the exclusive province of literary study (Riessman, 2001). In the field of second language teaching and learning, the use of narrative research has only flourished in the 1990s. The acceptance of narrative research as legitimate data can be traced back to the paradigm shift from positivistic quantitative research methodology toward naturalistic qualitative methodology. Until the 1970s, the dominant research paradigm

in second language learning was positivist (Potocka, 2011) rooted in the beliefs that knowledge to second language learning can be “captured through careful, systematic processes of data collection, analysis, and interpretation.” The knowledge gleaned from such a rigorous and systematic research methods was also believed to be “objective and can be measured” (Potocka, 2011, p. 170). Within this view, successful second language learning was achieved when learners have a particular set of desirable characteristics such as aptitude, motivation, learning styles, and attitude, among others. Research informed by the positivist paradigm perceives a unidirectional causality between the classroom behaviors of teacher, students, and student achievement (Clark and Peterson, 1986). Inherent in the positivist research paradigm is the belief that learning is the product of teaching.

Around 1980s, the positivist research paradigm was challenged by “process-oriented” (Nunan and Choi, 2001, p. 1) or “process-product” (Potocka, 2011, p. 170) research or, more commonly known as, qualitative research. Different from the product orientation of positivist research paradigm, qualitative research paradigm concerns more with the processes of learning a second language. Nunan (1989) notes that qualitative approach to second language learning focuses on “documenting and analyzing what actually goes on in the classroom, rather than simply measuring the end point of learning” (p. 6). It primarily seeks to explore the “complexities of teaching and learning in general” (Potocka, 2011, p. 171) rather than to find evidence of a superiority of a given method, coursebook, practice and/or certain characteristics of students.

Following the qualitative turn in the field of second language education is a focus on “the people who actually teach and learn languages and how the activities of teaching and learning languages fit into their lives” (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik, 2014, p. 11) and this is where the contribution of narrative research. Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) assert that narrative approaches to research have treat language learners not as object of inquiry but as human being who “actively engage in constructing the terms and conditions of their own learning” (p. 145). Despite the unique insights that narrative research brings to second language education, narrative research continues to be “underused” (Nelson, 2011, p. 480) and at an early stage (Barkhuizen, 2011). And therefore, it is “at a stage of needing to ... justify its existence and to theorize its rationale” (Nelson, 2011, p. 477). Indeed, in a recent survey of 10 international language learning and teaching journals between the years 1997-2006, Nelson (2011) reported that among nearly 500 articles, only around 10 percent were narratively-driven although they did not explicitly categorize them as narrative studies.

The impetus for the current paper is driven by the relatively recent uptake of narrative inquiry in second language teaching and learning. The

purpose is mainly to explore the contribution and insights gleaned from narrative inquiry into second language teaching and learning. The present chapter hopes to offer a modest contribution to the existing and ongoing attempt to find a place for narrative research in second language education.

What is narrative research?

Defining the term ‘narrative research,’ which at first sight might seem unproblematic and straightforward, turn out to be surprisingly difficult. Etymologically speaking, the term narrative research cannot be separated from the meaning of the word ‘narrative’ which in the simplest sense means “stories of experience” (Barkhuizen and Wette, 2008, pp. 373) or more elaborately as “a text that connects events, actions, and experiences across time and that additionally evaluates these events and experiences (Labov, 2006 cited in Menard-Warwick, 2011, p. 564). Therefore, ‘narrative research’ can be defined as any systematic inquiry that focuses on people’s stories (Barkhuizen and Wette, 2008) with regard to the way they were told, the linguistic devices use to represent the story, how people construe meaning from the narrative (Smith, 2001) and most significantly, identify patterns emerging from those stories.

There are several characteristics distinguishing narrative research from other types of research. For Smith (2001), narrative research generally focuses on exploring the link between meaning that inheres in the narrative within as well as across participants. Following Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik (2014), the word “participant” is used here as well as throughout the paper to refer to “the person whose experiences are narrated in a study (either biographically or autobiographically)” (p. 4). However, the way in which narrative researchers go about in exploring this link is “far from agreed upon” (Barkhuizen, 2011, p. 390) or do not follow one single universal approach (Sparkes, 2002). Indeed, Smith and Sparkes (in press) note that narrative research characterized by “tensions and connections, differences and similarities, and contrasts and disparity” (cited in Smith, 2001, p. 391). Therefore, Smith (2001) suggests treating narrative research as “an umbrella term for a mosaic of research efforts, with diverse theoretical musings, methods, empirical groundings, and/or significance all revolving around an interest in narrative” (Smith, 2001, p. 392).

Despite the seemingly disparate perspectives of what narrative research is, there is nevertheless an overarching commonality with regard to narrative data and data analysis, which will be the focus of the next sections.

Tools for Eliciting Narrative Data

In second language learning and teaching, narrative data consist of “texts which tell stories of lived experience” (Barkhuizen, 2011, p. 374). Mistry (1993) gives a broader definition of narrative to include “all types of discourse in which event structured materials is shared with readers or listeners, including fictional stories, personal narratives, accounts and recounts of events (real or imagined)” (p. 208). Although narrative research can utilize data from published language memoirs (see, for example, Pavlenko, 2001) and thus, do not need to be elicited, in second language education, there are tools to elicit data from L2 learners and teachers. By exploring narrative research conducted in second language education, I identify four tools commonly used to generate narrative data.

1. Interview

Interview might be the most common tool used to collect narrative data (Higgins and Sandhu, 2015). Compared to other tools, it is safe to say that narrative data collected through interviews were highly dialogic in nature. While in other tools (see below) the researcher’s involvement is somewhat limited to designing narrative prompts and/or template, the interview format allows the researcher to steer the direction of narrative data according to the topic of investigation. The interview used in narrative research is most often life history and unstructured although a few narrative research utilizes semi-structured interviews (see, for example, Manara 2013). Compared to qualitative interviewing, data collected through narrative interviews focus on a very limited number of participants.

A useful illustration of narrative research utilizing interview is Tsui’s (2007) study, in which she interviewed one EFL teacher from China, Minfang, to explore how he negotiated his teacher identity throughout his six years of teaching. Tsui explains that Minfang’s narrative was constructed over the span of six months. What is interesting, Tsui referred to the interview as “face-to-face storytelling” (p. 659) and “intensive face-to-face conversation”, which are characteristics of narrative interviewing. The informal and conversational natures of the interviews also allow Tsui to share her own experiences, which are only made possible with this type of tool of elicitation. Another study employing narrative interviewing is Plews, Breckenridge, and Cambre’s (2010) study. The study aimed to understand the professional experiences of four Mexican English teachers teaching their native tongue in an English-speaking environment. Here, interviews were chosen because of their ability to capture the complex relationship between

the social, personal, and psychological dimensions of the experience from the participants' perspectives. Together, these two studies illustrate that only through narrative interviewing, researchers are able to "gain a holistic understanding of an individual's experiences" (Higgins and Sandhu, 2015).

2. Journals and Diaries

Another tool to elicit narrative data is *journals or diaries*. Journals or diaries can be written both by L2 learners and L2 teachers. Pavlenko (2007) explained that L2 learners' journals can be written either "spontaneously or in response to teachers' and researchers' requests." However, informed by my experience utilizing journals in the classroom, they are most effective when integrated in class assessment. When extracting L2 narratives through journals, it is important to provide scaffolding or guidance to make sure the data gathered is "easily analyzable" (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik 2014, p.12) and "generate relevant insights" (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik 2014, p.12) into the topic of investigation or what Barkhuizen and Wette (2008) termed as 'narrative frames.' Examples of narrative frames in the areas of second language teaching and learning, research methodology, language curriculum and material development, and assessment in the language curriculum can be seen in Barkhuizen and Wette (2008, pp. 377).

3. Language learning history/autobiography

Third is *language learning history* (LLH) or "linguistic biographies" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 165). Different from journals or diaries which are often kept over a span of several weeks, LLH is written one time although to understand students' development over time, it can be revisited over a period of time or at the end of the course (see, for example, Cotterall and Murray, 2009). LLH is a written account tracing on a particular aspect of language learning (E.g. language, identity, writing development) and discuss how and why this aspect was "acquired, used, or abandoned" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 165). Through studying learners' LLHs, Murphey (1999) found that LLHs provide a meditational tool to stimulate learners' meta-awareness of factors affecting their learning. Most significantly, by writing their histories down, students could take ownership of their own learning process and thus, be more equipped for future learning.

4. Observation

Although observation is considered to be "the most common methods for qualitative data collection" (Trochim, 2002, p. 1), to the best of my knowledge, it is rarely found in narrative research, except for Gibson (2003). He studied the relationship between past experiences and the

development of professional knowledge of one pre-service teacher narrative accounts participating in a professional development program. The narrative accounts were elicited through participant observation. To collect a trustworthy narrative account, Gibson emphasized the need for the researcher to “[be] accepted” (p. 38) and engaged in the learning community achieved by a prolonged presence in the research context. He observed Kim (the participant) from the first day to the end of the semester (a total of fourteen weeks). Different from other tools of narrative elicitation, Gibson maintained that observation provides “much richer and thicker data” (p. 41). By opting for being a participant observer, Gibson was not only a researcher but more importantly “part of the community” (p.40) which gave him access to not only the words of the participant but also the visual images when she share about her personal and professional experiences. From Gibson’s study, it can be learned that narrative data collected through observation enable researcher to witness and record events as they unfold.

Although the tools for generating narrative data are discussed separately, it by no means indicates that they need to be used as such. Since people understanding of their own linguistic performance and competence do not always correspond to reality (Vitanova, 2004), certain issues (E.g. linguistic development, language shift) (Pavlenko, 2007) or certain research (E.g. longitudinal study, in-depth research) might require other data source, not merely narrative data. Pavlenko further explains that by triangulating narrative data with other data source, researchers can identify and explain inconsistencies as well as consistencies between events or “between content and form” (p. 169) as well as provide different ways of seeing the topic of investigation.

Issues in Eliciting Narrative Data

When eliciting narrative data from second language learners and teachers, there are several issues that researcher needs to be aware of. The first and immediate issue put forward by Pavlenko (2007), is the language of the elicitation (pp.172). To avoid compromising the representativeness of the narrative, Pavlenko (2008) suggests the language of the elicitation ideally should be in the language of the experience. However, for second language individuals this might not be straightforward. A possible reason can be explained by taking into account the concept of inner voice in second language learning, advanced by Tomlinson (2000). Inner voice is “speech sounds in the mind. [The language] we use ... whenever we talk to ourselves, whenever we want to develop our responses and thoughts, and whenever we need to make decisions or plans” (Tomlinson, 2000, cited in Zhang, 2001, p.

14). When researcher requires learners to produce a narrative, then, the learner needs to access their inner voice. It might be safely assumed that requiring participants to construct a narrative in a language of their inner voice might require less cognitive capability than in the second language. Therefore, language proficiency in L2 also needs to be considered when the L2 is the language of the telling. McCafferty's (1994) study reported that the higher proficiency levels in the language, the easier students were able to speak their minds.

To resolve the issue of the language of the elicitation, Pavlenko (2007) suggests considering the research purpose and the language shared between the researcher and participants. When the participant has a low proficiency in the L2, then, the L1 can be used provided that the participants and the researcher share the same language. However, when the study aims to explore the participant linguistic representation of an event, then, gathering narrative data in both languages might be useful because "the presentation of events may vary greatly with the language of the telling" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 172). Nekvapil (2003) suggests collecting several narratives from the same participants in all the participants' languages and ideally, these narratives should be collected by different interviewers to allow for different constructions of identities with different interviewers. Another practical alternative is to ask the participants in which language they want to share their narratives in as in Park (2012). In her study, the participant opts for sharing their narrative in English as a learning media to use the second language.

Second is the degree of "discursive collaboration" (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik 2014, p. 396). Degree of collaboration means the extent to which the process of data collection allows the researcher to be involved in shaping and reshaping the data. Each tool for eliciting data requires a different degree of collaboration between the researcher and the participants. Generally, oral tool, such as interviews, requires relatively high degree of collaboration between the researcher and the participant. For example, Barkhuizen (2006) disclosed that when he studied migrant participants, he was actively involved during the interview process "shaping both the content and the form of the narratives" (p. 396). Similarly, when conducting an interview to collect data on Indonesian teacher experiences studying in the US (Zacharias, 2010), my role during the interview process was not only shaping but also directing the data flow so that participants' narration of events aligned with the topic(s) of investigation.

Several narrative researchers point to the importance of critically reflecting on the role of researcher in shaping participants' narratives. One of those researchers is Menard-Warwick (2011). When writing a narrative account reflecting on the methodology of narrative analysis, Menard-

Warwick (2011) found that such a seemingly simple filler such as “Mmmhmm” was a significant tool encouraging the participant to elaborate. She further advances that being a “supportive” interviewer is paramount in the process of data collection. She writes that “Veronica’s [her participant] narrative was constructed in dialogue with a supportive interviewer, who said little but encouraged her to continue drawing connections between varied cultural experiences, not all tied explicitly to language learning” (p. 570).

If oral elicitation tools require a high degree of collaboration, written elicitation tools (E.g. journal/diaries and language learning history) invite little or even no researcher involvement during the process of construction. When collecting narrative data to explore students’ classroom participants (Zacharias, 2014), my involvement was limited to preparing the narrative prompt and providing written feedback. Also, written narratives are time-efficient to collect. It enables researchers to collect a large amount of data at the same time. In Barkhuizen and Wette’s study (2008), he utilized written narratives to gather data from 200 teachers participated in a summer teacher education program in China. In addition, writing allows more time for the participants to think through and construct their narrative.

Certainly the lack of researcher involvement of some data tools has consequences to the quality of narrative data. With tools that allow for high discursive collaboration between the researcher and narrator (E.g. interviews), researcher is able to scaffold both in terms of content and language to generate narrative data that are consistent with the topic of investigation. Even when participants share experiences that seem irrelevant, researcher can ask for clarification or redirect the narrative flow to the issue at hand. Unfortunately, this is not available to tools that allow for little researcher collaboration. To this end, Barkhuizen recommends the use of ‘narrative templates’ (Barkhuizen and Wette, 2008, 2014). Narrative frames are “writing frames” (Barkhuizen and Wette, 2008, p. 375). Narrative frames have at least two functions: to guide the participants of what to write (content scaffolding) and to provide structural scaffolding helping participants to a possible organization pattern of their narrative (organizational scaffolding). Despite the limitation of narrative frame to quality of narrative data, Barkhuizen and Wette (2008) maintains that they aid the narrative analysis because the narrative data are already structured in “narratively sequenced arrangement of the frames” (p.381) directly relevant to the aim of the study.

Narrative Analysis: Principles and Strategies

By discussing narrative data and narrative analysis in separate section, I am not suggesting that narrative data collection and analysis should be conducted separately. In fact in narrative analysis, as in any qualitative research, “there is no particular moment when data analysis begins” (Stake, 1995, p. 71). However, for practicality purpose, I found it useful to start data analysis when formulating the tools to elicit narrative data. Such an early start may provide a direction and “refine data collection strategies” (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik, 2014, p. 73). When conducting narrative analysis, Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik (2014) point to the need to pay attention to the principles of iterative, emergent, and interpretative.

Iterative

Iterative-ness, first coined by Dörnyei (2007), is a process to describe the analysis process in qualitative research. If quantitative analysis tends to be “orderly” (p. 243) and “in a linear manner” (p. 243), qualitative analysis is likely iterative, that is, “nonlinear” or “zig-zag” (p. 243) or messy; moving back and forth between data collection, analysis and interpretation. Also, it is not uncommon for qualitative researcher to collect complementary data during the data analysis and interpretation processes as depicted in a study by Tsui (2007). In studying the narrative of Minfang, an EFL teacher from China, the data collection did not stop after she conducted face-to-face interview and collected his diaries. Tsui continued to “reshaped and enriched [the diaries] as I [the researcher] responded to his diaries by sharing my own experiences and probing for more information” (p. 659). Indeed, Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006) warn against collecting too much data at the initial stage of the research because it may “distract us [the researcher] from reflecting on details” (p. 370).

Despite the iterative-ness of the narrative analysis process, once the data are gathered they need to be organized in such a way to make the patterns of regularity and irregularity visible within and across narratives, and thus, can be easily observed, measured, and represented. To ease the data analysis process, Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik (2014) suggest researchers to consider the form of narrative data; whether or not it is already in a narrative form (E.g. published language autobiography, elicited language learning history, or completed narrative frames). In narrative analysis, the form of data will, to a certain degree, guide the direction of the data analysis and interpretation.

Emergent

The second principle often associated with narrative analysis is the idea of emergent (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik, 2014). Different from quantitative data analysis where category has been predetermined even prior to gathering data (Dörnyei, 2007), in narrative analysis the categories or codes ideally should emerge as a result of “hard, and often creative, interpretative work” (Barkhuizen, Benson, and Chik, 2014, p. 73). However, emergent here should not be taken to mean that categories and themes are free-floating ready to be captured through data analysis process. In fact, Pavlenko (2007) asserts that when analyzing narrative data, researcher needs to formulate theoretical framework through which potential themes can be drawn. This so-called “prefigured” (Creswell, 2007, p. 152) theme helps researcher in the data analysis process to provide a lens through which data can be read and interpreted. On studying 17 PRC ESL learners on their English learning experience in an intensive English course in Singapore, some of Sim’s (2006) major themes –motivation, beliefs about themselves as language learners, differences to learning English in China and Singapore and teachers’ role—were drawn from literature review on factors affecting second language acquisition. In studying the identity development of an EFL teacher in China, Tsui (2007) analyzed the data based on the literature reviews of identity development proposed by Wenger (1998).

Despite the potential benefits of prefigured themes, they should not be treated as straightjackets but rather, suggestions. Researcher needs to maintain an open minded attitude of new themes or categories initially not included in the theoretical framework but might emerge through the data collection and/or analysis process. In a study of nine female EFL teachers working in higher education in Japan, Simon-Maeda (2004) admitted that she needed to change the initial focus of the interview (sexual discrimination in the work place) to accommodate for Mariah’s, the participant, experience in racial discriminative practice in job recruitment. Similarly, in a narrative study of 85 Indonesian learners’ classroom participation, Zacharias (2014) refocuses the data analysis to center on teacher factors affecting learners’ classroom participation because “teacher-related variables were found to be recurring themes in majority of the student narratives” (p. 2).

Interpretativeness

When conducting the analysis, narrative researchers have warned us to see narrative data not as facts but “discursive constructions” (Pavlenko, 2007, p.216). This leads us to the third principle of narrative analysis in addition to iterative and emergent, which is *interpretativeness*. Dörnyei (2007) maintains that the data analysis in qualitative research is “ultimately

the product of the researcher's subjective interpretation of the data" (p. 37). It is impossible to ensure that narrative analysis is free from the researcher's conceptual bias with regard to culture, race, and educational background, to name a few, as well as read from no theoretical standpoints.

With the interpretative principle also comes the understanding that the interpretation of narrative analysis is only part of the many possible interpretations and thus, need to be subjugated to continuous questioning (Lee and Simon-Maeda, 2006, p. 575) and reinterpretation. In their personal narrative, for example, Simon-Maeda (in Lee and Simon-Maeda, 2006) reminded the readers that her narrative constructions of the participants should not be taken as "the truth." In analyzing the narratives of Xia, a nonnative English speaker studying in the US, Park (2012) reminded readers that her "interpretation is one of many possible readings of the data presented to data" (p.134).

Although all narrative researchers might agree that narrative studies are fundamentally subjective, the degree to which this subjectivity should be addressed in research reports is varied. In her study of one EFL teacher in China, Minfang, Tsui's (2007) role in shaping the data collected was done through responding to Minfang's diaries, sharing her own experience, and probing for more information. The role was shared by Manara (2013) when studying four Indonesian teacher educators. She wrote that her role was "enabling myself as interviewer" (p. 1198) and asking different variations of questions. Plews, Breckenridge, and Cambre's (2010) role to control their subjectivity was conducted not during the data collection stage as in the case of Tsui (2007) and Manara (2013). Prior to the interviewing process, they conducted two think aloud sessions; one before interviewing the first two participants and another before interviewing the second two participants. However, the extent to which this strategy is successful in minimizing researcher subjectivity is no where to be found in the report.

Different from Tsui (2007), Manara (2013) and Plews, a few, yet growing number of, narrative researchers felt the need to address this issue more elaborately and openly (see, among others, Menard-Warwick, 2011; Simon-Maeda, 2004). Simon-Maeda (2004) for example, shares that her status as English teacher, a long-term resident of Japan and an expatriate were attributes that she continually reflected on when interviewing her female participants of color. Together, Simon-Maeda and Lee (2006) wrote a full-brown paper interrogating the extent to which their racial identities mediate the data collection and analysis processes. Menard-Warwick (2011) narrated the "methodological decisions, inspirations, and dilemmas" (p. 565) when analyzing narratives in particular the effect of different analytical focus to the discursive construction of participants' narratives. By addressing the subjective nature of narrative data analysis explicitly in the

research reports, these researchers show that they were aware of this and have taken any necessary attempts to manage them.

Other than being critical to what being added during the analysis process, interpretativeness also entails being critical to what is being omitted, which rarely addressed during the narrative analysis stage. Silverman notes that “[e]very way of seeing is also a way of not seeing” (2000, p. 825). Lee’s (in Lee and Maeda), to my knowledge, is one among the few narrative researchers who draw attention to how researcher’s races may perpetuate “what is being omitted”. When interviewing one of her participants, Lisa, she noticed that Lisa often utter phrases such as “if you understand what I’m saying” or “I don’t know if you’ve had that [feeling] before”. Upon reflection, Lee wondered if “Lisa would have made such rhetorical asides if she were being interviewed by a White researcher” (p. 584). This reflective awareness has given her insight to the way the participant’s view of Lee’s position. To the participant of color, Lee was not only a researcher but also “a legitimate speaker and listener to her experiences” (p. 584).

There are different ways that researchers can do to minimize researcher’s subjectivity. One way is by applying some sorts of distance during the data analysis process commonly known as member-checking. Member-checking can be loosely defined as involving the participants in the data analysis process. The literature of narrative research reports showed that member-checking can be conducted in different stages of data analysis process. In Park (2012), for example, she invited the participants to member-check their demographic information displayed in a table form. In Mitton-Kükner, Nelson, and Desrochers’ study (2010), they sent the interview transcripts to the participants. In another study, member-checking was conducted in a much later stage of the data analysis process. When analyzing Hu’s narratives, an EFL teacher in China, Liu and Xu (2011) utilized a four-step narrative analysis process: 1) Making sense of the narratives; 2) Coding themes; 3) Reconstructing the narratives for a storyline; and 4) Telling and retelling, living and reliving the stories. It is not until Liu and Xu’s (the 4th step) completed the process of creating and building Hu’s (the participant) narratives that they shared it with Hu.

Issues related to narrative research methodology will undoubtedly be with us for years and even decades to come. By making readers aware of the principles of iterative, emergent, and interpretative in narrative analysis process, hopefully they can be minimized and thought through when conducting narrative research.

Closing Remarks

The paper ends with ‘closing remarks’ rather than a ‘conclusion’ to index that at this point narrative research is still in infancy and an emerging methodology that needs further exploration and discussion before any conclusion can be made. The paper has outlined the different tools to gather narrative data in second language teaching and learning. It also attempts to identify issues that researcher needs to pay attention when dealing with narrative data. It is worth noting that the overall purpose of the chapter is not to imply that narrative data and analysis should replace other tools of data elicitation and analysis. Rather, it aims to invite teachers and researchers to see narratives as a viable option in research as the methodology continues to move forward. Hopefully, what has been discussed in the present paper provides insights to existing, yet limited, overview of narrative data and analysis commonly found in second language teaching and learning.

The author

Nugrahenny T. Zacharias is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Miami University, Ohio, USA. Before her current teaching post, she lectured as a teacher-educator at the English Teacher Education (ETE) department of Faculty of Language and Literature at Satya Wacana Christian University. Her research interest is in the area of teacher reflective practice and EIL pedagogy in second language teaching and learning. She has published in various international journals.

References

- Barkhuizen, G. (2006). Immigrant parents’ perceptions of their children’s language practices: Afrikaans speakers of living in New Zealand. *Language Awareness*, 15(2), 63-79.
- Barkhuizen, G. and Wette, R. (2008). Narrative frames for investigating the experiences of language teachers. *System*, 36, 372-387
- Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative knowledging in TESOL, *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 391-414.
- Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., Chik, A. (2014). *Narrative Inquiry in Language Teaching and Learning Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Clark, C. M. and Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers’ thought processes. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (255-296). New York: Macmillan.

- Cotterall, S. and Murray, G. (2009). Enhancing metacognitive knowledge: Structure, affordances and self. *System*, 37, 34-45.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design (2nd ed.)*: *Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibson, S. (2003). Narrative of a pre-service teacher. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 2(3), 35-46.
- Hesse-Biber, N. S. and Leavy, P. (2006). *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Higgins, C. and Sandhu, P. (2015). Researching identity through narrative approaches. In M. Bigelow and J. Enns-Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 50-62). New York: Routledge.
- Labov, W. (2006). Narrative pre-construction. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 37-45.
- Lantolf, J.P. and Pavlekno, A. (2001). (S)econd (L)anguage (A)ctivity Theory: Understanding Second Language Learners as People. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner Contributions to Language Learning* (pp. 141-158). London: Longman.
- Lee, E. and Simon-Maeda, A. (2006). Racialized research identities in ESL/EFL research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 573-594.
- Liu, Y. and Xu, Y. (2011). Inclusion or exclusion?: A narrative inquiry of a language teacher's identity experience in the 'new work order' of competing pedagogies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 589-597.
- Manara, C. (2013). English language educators' professional learning as a site of identity struggle. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(3), 1193-1212.
- McCafferty, S. G. (1994). The use of private speech by adult ESL learners at different levels of proficiency. In J.P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 117-134). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2011). A methodological reflection on the process of narrative analysis: Alienation and identity in the life histories of English language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 564-574.
- Mistry, J. (1993). Cultural context in the development of children's narratives. In J. Altarriba (ed.), *Cognition and Culture: A Cross-cultural Approach to Psychology* (pp. 207-228). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.

- Mitton-Kükner, J., Nelson, C., and Desrochers, C. (2010). Narrative inquiry in service learning contexts: Possibilities for learning about diversity in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1162-1169.
- Murphey, T. (1999). Publishing students' language learning histories: For them, their peers, and their teachers. *Between the keys: The newsletter of the JALT material writers SIG* 7(2), 8-11.
- Nekvapil, J. (2003). Language biographies and the analysis of language situations: On the life of the German community in the Czech Republic. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 162, 63-83.
- Nelson, C. D. (2011). Narratives of classroom life: Changing conceptions of knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(2), 463-485.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D. and Choi, J. (2001). *Language and Culture: Reflective narratives and emergence of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 127-146.
- Pavlenko, A. (2001). "In the world of the tradition I was unimagined": Negotiation of identities in cross-cultural autobiographies. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 317-344.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163-188.
- Pavlenko, A. (2008). Narrative analysis. In L. Wei and M. G. Moyer (Eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilinguals and Multilingualism* (pp. 311-325). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Plews, J. L., Breckenridge, Y., and Cambre, M. (2010). Mexican English teachers' experiences of international professional development in Canada: A narrative analysis. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 7(1), 5-20.
- Potocka, D. (2011). Second language teacher education: Shifting paradigms and future challenges. In M. Pawlak (Ed.), *Extending the Boundaries of Research on Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 169-180). Berlin: Springer.
- Riessman, C. K. (2001). Analysis of personal narratives. In J.F. Gurbium and J.A. Holstein, (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method* (pp. 695-710). New York: Sage.
- Sim, F. Y. (2006). "Don't worry a lot, dear!: Reflections of PRC ESL learners on their English language learning experience. *Reflections on English language teaching*, 5(2), 25-46.

- Simon-Maeda, A. (2004). The complex construction of professional identities: female EFL educators in Japan speak out. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 406-436.
- Smith, B. (2001). The state of the art in narrative inquiry: Some reflections. *Narrative Inquiry*, 17(2), 391-398.
- Smith and Sparkes (in press). Contrasting perspectives on narrating selves and identities: An invitation to dialogue. *Qualitative Research*.
- Sparkes, A. C. (2002). *Telling Tales in Sport and Physical Activity: A qualitative journey*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Human Kinestics Press.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Tomlinson, B. (2000). Talking to yourself: The role of the inner voice in language learning. *Applied Language Learning*, 11(2), 123-154.
- Troschim, W. (2002). *Research methods knowledge base*. Retrieved December 10, 2003 from <http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/tutorial/>.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 657- 680.
- Vitanova, G. (2004). Gendered enactments in immigrants' discursive practices: Bringing Bakhtin to the dialogue. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3(4), 261-277.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zacharias, N.T. (2010). The teacher identity construction of 12 Asian NNEST teachers in TESOL graduate programs. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(2), 177-197. Retrieved from http://www.asiatefl.org/journal/main_sample24.html
- Zacharias, N.T. (2014). Second language teacher contributions to student classroom participation: A narrative study of Indonesian learners. *ELTWorldOnline*, <http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/?p=4358>
- Zhang, L. J. (2001). My inner voice is telling me: Students' inner voice as metacognition about language learning. *REACT*, 20(1), 13-20.